INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT
FOR:

Jeremi Learning

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	Satisfactory	Lesson matches original description	Approaching Standard (2)	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Meeting Standard (3)	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Meeting Standard (3)	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting	Satisfactory	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Approaching/Meeting Standard (2.5)		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	Satisfactory	Student/instructor ratio:	Meeting Standard (3)		

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Jeremi's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2006-2007 school year, an observation and only a limited document analysis was completed for the 2007-2008 school year).

ACTION NEEDED:

- Corrective action was submitted related to the start-up process.
- An action plan was submitted for the minor changes needed to the progress report.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric
DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Jeremi Learning

REVIEWER: MC

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 3/4/08

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	**ALL** of the following: -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.)	• Documentation of PD (sign-in sheets) • PD description		X	• Initial professional development includes administrative issues and information about Jeremi's pedagogy (TfU), ISTEP+, and Indiana Academic standards. • Agenda from November teacher development workshop covers tutor responsibilities, tutor's aide responsibilities, behavior management, and monitoring and evaluation. • December pd includes state monitoring, self-checklist, tutor evaluation, and lesson plans. • Professional development workshops appear thorough. • Sign-in sheets were provided for beginning of year training and professional development.
Progress Reporting	**ALL** of the following: -Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent	• Individual Education Plans also serve as progress reports • Letters to parents explaining reports and documenting reports sent • Letters to school districts		X	• Individual learning plans (Individual Education Plans) also serve as progress reports and include pre-test scores, goals (for increasing pre-test score), assessment information, standards to be covered, and • Feedback from one district indicates that Jeremi learning is submitting progress reports in a timely manner. • Letters to parents about the progress reports provide helpful information for parents to read the progress reports.

		documenting reports sent			• Progress reports provide information about pre-assessments, mid-term assessments, and post-assessments (as applicable), as well as student progress toward goals and toward mastering identified standards. • On the final progress report, it would be helpful to share with parents/districts whether or not students met goals or what progress they made toward goals. • Progress reports were generally consistent across districts (Individual Education Plans are utilized). Some progress reports (Individual Education Plans) from School City of East Chicago and Hammond included mid-term goals and goals based on the pre-assessment. However, not all progress reports included this information. See below; please ensure that all progress reports include this information. • As per IDOE guidance sent in the progress report checklist (sent to all providers in December), all progress reports should include goals from the SES agreement (which some, but not all progress reports include) and a statement that if parents have feedback on how to improve the progress report, they can contact the provider (provide contact information).
Assessment and Individual Program Design	**ALL** of the following: -Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student 　- Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment	• Individual learning plans • SES agreements • Daily lesson plans for students for whom ILPs were submitted • SES contracts for Hammond, East Chicago		X	• Individual learning plan includes pre-test data and specific standards identified for students. • Individual lesson plans clearly indicate standards covered, lesson objectives, instructional methods and materials, and student progress during and after the session. • While some ILPs include specific, measurable goals (i.e., desired score on post-assessment; gain one grade level, etc.), not all ILPs include this information. In addition, while most ILPs

	correlates to Indiana academic standards.				specifically articulate what "instructor's assessment of student language arts; instructor's assessment of student math" means, the ILPs for some students simply mentioned standards. That may be unclear to parents. It is recommended that the tutor spell out student strengths/areas for improvement in these areas like they did in other districts.

On-site Monitoring Rubric
OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Jeremi Learning   **DATE:** 1/28/08, 2/25/08

SITE: Kuny Elementary (Gary Com. Schools); Jeremi Learning (Hammond)   **REVIEWER:** MC/KS

5625 Hohman Ave., Hammond, IN

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): 7 tutors   **TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 3:00PM; 4:15PM

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 7

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving "1 or 2 points" on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		X			At the first site, students had not begun lessons when the reviewers arrived. At 3:00PM, students began working in small groups, although some students worked independently because they were testing. One group worked on figuring out different ways to count money (i.e., multiple ways to get 75 cents, multiple ways to get $1.00, etc.). Students then worked on counting money by 5's. Then students were assigned a worksheet on telling time; it was not clear why students switched from working on money to working on time. Students also did not appear to understand the shift. The concept was not introduced, nor was any review done. The shift seemed somewhat abrupt. Students were told to work independently on their time worksheets. The tutor struggled a bit because she was trying to work with one group and tutor them while at the same time testing another student. In another group, the site director worked with a group of 4 students on main idea and reading comprehension. The students took turns reading a story, and the tutor tested student comprehension of vocabulary and comprehension of the story. A small group of kindergarteners worked on a lesson putting things in categories, although not all students appeared to understand the objective of the lessons. Another group of four students were completing their pre-assessment. At the second site, students were divided into grade levels and were in various rooms throughout the site. The 4th grade group worked on worksheets for Reading. The tutor rotated between working with each student. The tutor did try to spend time with each student, but not a lot of actual instruction was provided in this group. Instead, the tutor

					appeared to be primarily correcting student mistakes or providing directions for completing the worksheets. The tutor indicated that once all students had finished, the group would go over the worksheet together. In the 2nd and 3rd grade groups, each student group had textbooks. In the 2nd grade group, the students took turns reading a passage from the textbook. The tutor picked certain vocabulary words from the reading and discussed them with students. The tutor engaged students in the discussion and utilized various techniques to check comprehension. Students seemed to be at very different reading levels in the group, but the tutor did a good job ensuring that they all comprehended vocabulary words. In the 3rd grade group, the students primarily worked independently on worksheets. Not a lot of tutor interaction was observed, except to provide clarification or directions. In the other 3rd grade group, the tutor had posted the lesson objectives for the day. The group read together (or one student read aloud and other students followed). The tutor employed a variety of techniques to ensure student comprehension. After every few sentences, the tutor would check students' reading comprehension in a variety of ways. In the kindergarten group, the students showed projects that they had been working on to demonstrate the letter "a". Students then underlined "a's" in their sentences. All students had whiteboards that they were working on; they were required to demonstrate what they learned based on what the tutor taught them. The tutor indicated that they were reviewing "a" and "b" and planned to move on to "c" and "d". At both sites (the first and second), some groups were engaged in activities that match the provider's description in the application. In these groups, tutors provided tutor-led instruction in which they reviewed what was learned previously and required students to reproduce what they had learned in a variety of ways. However, in some other lessons, students appeared to work primarily independently on worksheets or workbook pages with very little tutor interaction, or lessons appeared to be poorly planned and not organized around review, practice, or a particular lesson objective (as described in the application). At the first site, group divisions were not always clear and it was not always clear who was teaching which group. While it is understandable that it takes some time to get tutoring going, it is important, because the district is being invoiced for all sessions, that all tutoring sessions are of high quality and match the description in the provider application. It is also important that all sessions are organized. It is recommended that tutors who are assigned to conduct pre- and post-testing are not also assigned groups of students to work with, as it appeared very difficult for tutors to rotate between both.
Instruction is clear				X		In most lessons, tutors were able to articulate lesson objectives to students. In several cases, tutors employed a variety of instructional strategies to ensure that all students comprehended the information being provided. In a few lessons (especially at the first site), tutors sometimes struggled to ensure that students understood lesson objectives or transitions. In a few cases, tutors were expected to implement assessments while tutoring at the same time, which sometimes made it difficult for tutors to insure clarity of instruction. At the second site, most tutors did a very good job ensuring that lesson plans and objectives were clear and that all students comprehended concepts.

Time on task is appropriate				X		At the first site, some students struggled to stay on task at first, because the site was somewhat disorganized. However, after a few minutes, the tutors and site directors worked to get students in their groups, on task and working on things. Although not all lessons appeared to have clear purposes or were clearly organized, students remained on task and tutors attempted to redirect students who were not paying attention. At the second site, most groups were on task and enjoying the lessons that they were participating in. Some groups of students especially expressed excitement at what they were learning. While there were a few occasions when students got off task, tutors generally did a good job getting students back on task and focused.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable			X			At the second site, most tutors appeared to have a good knowledge of students' academic levels and personalities. In addition, they appeared to have clear lesson plans that they were following. While a few tutors did not always appear to have the expertise to keep students on task and on track to achieve the lesson objectives, most tutors employed a variety of techniques to engage students and ensure that they were practicing concepts taught and that they comprehended the information. At the first site, tutors struggled somewhat to keep students on task and did not always appear to have clearly organized lessons. In addition, tutors did not always appear to have a clear understanding of what groups of students should be working on.
Student/instructor ratio: 8:1, 5:1, 4:1, 5:1, 3:1, 3:1, 4:1, Ratio matches that reported in original provider application				X	■	Ratio matches that in amended provider application.